THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Vol. III, No. 19 | Telephone: DRYdock 1656 NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, May 10, 1930 | PRICE 5 CENTS

Whalen's Anti-Red Forgeries

Peshawur and the Gandhi Arrest

The almost impenetrable veil of official British censorship continues to make it difficult to get a clear and well-rounded picture of the situation in India. That the British are being hard pressed, however, can easily be seen even though the highly colored official reports that are allowed to filter through. They have finally been compelled to arrest Gandhi. They are taking fear-stricken measures to confiscate all arms and ammunition in the hands of the Indian people. They have been forced—openly, at last—to admit the dispatch of substantial military forces of infantry and cavalry, accompanied by airplane fleets, to the most turbulent sections of the country.

MacDonald: Servant of Capital

All these actions, let it not be forgotten for a moment, are being taken by the British government that has been advertised everywhere by the liberals and socialists as the "most progressive and enlightened" in the world, the "Labor" government of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. Where is the democratic Laborite freedom of the press which is announced as so superior to the methods of the Communists? Sunk without a trace by the censors! Where is the "democratic" opposition to imperialism? It exists only in the mealy, pious speeches of MacDonald, agent par excellence of the British moneybags, jailor and executioner of the Indian masses!

India is today an armed camp, but armed only on one side. For that, the Indian masses have Mr. Gandhi to thank. It is under his treacherous direction, his insistence upon pacifism and non-resistance, that the Indian people are today defenseless before the imperialist troops armed to the teeth and ready to repeat an Amritsar massacre on an All-Indian scale—without fear of successful resistance. Rarely has the British lion been served so well by Gandhi. He has hog-tied the Indian masses, and trapped them in the paralyzing jaws of non-resistance.

But the arrest of Gandhi shows that he has accomplished—against his every desire and will—something else, too. Just as the Kerenskys involuntarily aroused a genuine revolutionary movement by their timid opposition to the czar; just as the Chiang Kai-Sheks unwillingly let loose a mass movement in China, so the sensational march to the sea of Gandhi has roused millions of the people to a militant mood which is already overflowing the reactionary boundary lines he originally staked out for it.

The Meaning of Peshawar

The sharp struggles in Peshawur, which required the dispatch of large numbers of British troops, made a mockery of Gandhi's treasonable policies and indicated the correct way to remove the British yoke. The "passive" mutiny in Peshawur of the native Garhwal Indian Rifles is the prologue to active resistance and militant offensive. A real fight against British imperialism, in the interests of the Indian masses and not of the Indian bourgeoisie, can only be led in spite of Gandhi and in direct battle against him and his.

The absence of a conscious, organized revolutionary movement—a crime of ommission for which the Stalinized course of the Communist International must still answer—hampers the development of the struggle. But it can yet be created in the fires of conflict. Peshawur shows the possibilities.

Φ

N. Y. JOBS SCARCEST SINCE 1914

NEW YORK—Factory employment in New York state, Gov. Roosevelt announces, is at the lowest point since 1914. It has dropped steadily since last October, he said, and will probably drop further, as it usually does in May. The Annalist, financial weekly, states that national employment is the lowest since 1922.

Mr. Cosssack Whalen is now well on the downward road to the other "great" American Red baiters who preseded him: A. Mitchell Palmer and ex-mayor Ole Hanson of Seattle. Not to be outdone by either of them, or by their international colleagues who concocted the anti-Soviet forgeries in Berlin and the "Zinoviev letter" in England a few years ago, this cheap Tammany Hall politician has gained another bit of brief publicity for himself by publishing as crude a set of forgeries as have yet come *of the press. It seems that Whalen is intent upon proving that there is a Communist movement in the United States and that it has connections with the revolutionary movement in the Soviet Union!*

Nevertheless, the appearance of the forgeries at this particular moment is far from accidental. The stage setting for them has been in preparation for some time. The development of a sharp unemployment situation in the United States with the accompanying disillusionment of millions of workers on the score of American capitalism's fabled "permanent prosperity", has opened up previously non-existing prospects for the growth of the American Communist movement.

Whalen's forgeries are calculated to nip this growth in the bud, to whip up sufficient anti-Red hysteria to cut it down before it assumes really dangerous proportions for the class he represents. He is not alone. The rapidity with which Congress has snapped at the opportunity to organize a public demonstration in preparation for a national anti-Communist lynching campaign is indicative of the general spirit of the masters. All of them are quite well aware of the fact that outside of the Communist movement, despite all the enormous and persistent blunders of the official Party, there is no force working actively and energetically to mobilize the permanent army of unemployed to fight for their lives, literally for their lives.

Every worker must therefore be vigilantly on guard for the next step of capitalist reaction. The scheme to crush the Communist movement, to jail its fighters, to deport and harass the foreign-born workers in particular, is aimed not only at the Communists, but at the whole working class in which the Reds so justly hated by the bosses, constitute the most militant section. Every blow the capitalist class and its Congress strike at the Communists hits with redoubled force at the interests of the whole working class.

There is yet another reason for the Whalen forgeries. They follow hard on the heels of the bomb plot against the Soviet embassy in Poland, the anti-Soviet military maneuvers of the Rumanian and Polish marionettes of French imperialism, and the hypocritical religious crusade against the Soviets which stank so noticeably of good Stock Exchange gold. All these events were timed with the sharpening of the economic and political difficulties in the Soviet Union rising out of the industrialization and collectivization campaign. All these incidents are calculated to exert a violent pressure upon the Soviet power, and the Party which exercizes it, that will make it veer to the Right.

The Pressure on the Soviet Union

Knowing Stalin for what he really represents, the reactionary forces throughout the world are keenly aware of the fact that precisely at the present moment a well-concentrated pressure can strengthen the toe-hold of capitalist elements in Russia by compelling a shift to the Right. But the class relations in the Soviet Union are so taut right now, that a sharp turn to the Right, already implicit in all of Stalin's recent acts and words, would have the gravest effects not only upon the workers' class republic but upon the proletarian movement throghout the world.

The anti-Soviet drive in the United States, even though based upon the schoolboy documents that many capitalist papers refuse to take seriously, is a timely reminder of a danger. A blow at Soviet Russia is a blow at the Communist movement. In turn, and because of that, it is an even heavier blow at the whole working class. The common danger and the common injury demand a common front. All workers: on guard!

Judge Denies Bail to Foster, Minor, Amter

Bail for the leaders of the March 6 unemployment demonstration, including William Z. Foster, I. Amter, Robert Minor, and Harry Raymond, has been refused by supreme court justice Gavegan in New York. The four Communists have begun serving the three year term to which they were sentenced under star chamber proceedings and without the possibility of introducing evidence or defense witnesses.

The crassly class character of the prosecution was more than demonstrated during the trial, and the judges gave the defendants the vicious an almost unprecedented sentence of three years.

It is evident that the convictions were aimed primarily to curb the movement of the unemployed workers among whom the Communists are the most active elements. All the more reason why every effort must be made to compel the most rapid release of the four prisoners. Thus far their defense has been organized by the Party on the narrowest possible basis with the result that the fine opportunities for developing a broad movement for the four have not even been approached.

The New York convictions are but ominous forerunners of persecutions against militant fighters of the working class throughout the country. They cannot therefore be understood merely as an isolated instance of capitalist violence against the Communists. Nor can the bosses and their police, court and gangland agents be effectively combated by the Communists alone, much less by the official Communist Party only. The arrests and persecutions all over the country in connection with the unemployed demonstrations the May Day meetings as well as at other working class gatherings make imperative a genuine mobilization of all progressive, Left wing and Communist forces ready to unite on a program of resistance to the terror and persecutions of the employing class and for the freedom of all class war prisoners, for the establishment of full civil rights for workers and working class organizations, etc.

It is necessary to change this course immediately, and take advantage of the general sentiment against the convictions that exists and can be aroused among broad sections of the workng class. A united defense for the prisoners is the best reply to the harpies of class justice.

Φ

NEW YORK—Trial of 46 Brooklyn shoe workers for violating an injunction taken out by the Diana Shoe Co. against the Independent Shoe Workers Union has been postpoen to June 3. The company broke its contract with the workers when Charles G. Wood, red baiter, of the federal labor conciliation service, notified it that the union was led by Communists. The injunction sustained the company's refusal to contine a contract with a Communist-led group.

Max Shachtman

Delegate to the International Conference of the Opposition in Paris. Just returned from a Visit with Leon Trotsky

WILL SPEAK ON THE

"WORLD REVOLUTION AND THE OPPOSITION"

AT THE

LABOR TEMPLE

242 East 14th Street (near 2nd Avenue)

ON

Thursday, May 15th, 1930 at 8 P. M.

ADMISSION: 25 CENTS

Auspices of the New York Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Wall St. Speaks

Hoover's Bunk

"The second qaurter of the year," comments the Annalist, financial weekly of the New York Times on Hoover's recent "optimistic" statement about the turn for the better, "opening with business activity approximately at the depression level of last December, offers no reasonable prospect of other than an uneven and low progress out of the valley of the current business cycle. The normal relations of production and consumption have been disorganized. Productive facilities, and all commodities including bank credit as used, are present in excess. The new stabilization that needs to be worked out is threatened by existing cheap money policy and rising speculation.

Cynical Over "Predictions"

The Annalist sees a "broad valley of depression out of which business is not likely to emerge in much less than six months or so." Hitting directly at the Hoover prosperity pronouncements the Wall St. weekly says: "Another point to be noted is the indubitable fact of a reaction among business men against the cheerful business propaganda initiated at Washington. The ironical fashion in which business events have repudiated cuccessive 'bally-hoo' official statements from Washington has had its logical effect on the business mind—it has produced a conviction not only that the government does not know the facts, but that the facts are probably rather worse than has been generally supposed even outside of Washington."

The Annalist index of business activity even below the lowest previous mark of for March, its latest figure, shows business December. Freight car loadings, electric power production, cotton and wool consumption and soft coal and zinc production were all below the December figure.

Φ

LITTLE PIECE OF FORGOTTEN HISTORY

The Daily Worker of May 7, 1930 writes, greeting the "new" Weekly Young Worker organ of the Young Communist League, as follows: "In the United States the youth movement has long lagged behind. There has not been a weekly youth paper before in this country." The author of those lines must have joined the Party a few weeks ago. Had he been in it very much longer, he might have remembered that more than four years ago the Young Workers League launched the Weekly Young Worker and maintained it for a long period of time, successfully, too. It was only when the immediate predecessors of the present misfits in the League "took over the power" that they wrecked it—a job they have conducted with great success to the present day!

Bluff, Brother, Bluff! Someone Will Believe It

The Crusader News Agency is a press service directed and controlled by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, under the immediate responsibility of Cyril Briggs. It is intended primarily for Negro newspapers in the country, and is one of the methods by which the Party brings its viewpoint to the Negro workers. In its press release for the week of May 5, 1930, it prints the following astounding report of the New York May Day parade and meeting:

"In this city (New York) over 300,000 workers, Negro and white, answered the call of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. to 'strike and demonstrate'."

And further: "Oved 70,000 joined in a gigantic, colorful parade from Rutgers Square through some of the worst slum districts to Union Square where the biggest meeting of the day was held."

The Daily Worker is the official organ of the Communist Party. That it exaggerated the facts in its reports of the May Day demonstrations goes without saying: it's in the blood. But it never dared go so far as its colleague, the Crusader News Agency. Its issue of May 2, 1930, says:

"A hundred and fifty thousands New York workers (not 300,000!) turned out yesterady, striking and demonstrating on May Day."

And speaking of the paradeff "The procession began shortly before 1:30. And, what a procession? A close (close, Briggs!) checkup indicated 25,000 in line (not 70,000 Briggs!)."

But what is a little matter like an additional—even if non-existent—150,000 strikers to the Party bluffers? Or a matter like an additional 45,000 marchers who never marched? In the third period, the Party leadership calculate, the best way to win the masses to Communism, and (evidently) the Negro workers especially, is to bluff and bluff and bluff. Surely someone will believe it!

After May Day's Demonstrations

Even the briefest review of the May Day demonstrations this year must begin with a clearing of the air so that the facts become visible. That means—unfortunately nowaday—to discount from the very beginning all the figures given in the official Communist Party press. The definite informatiion we have already received about a dozen of the most important cities shows what recent experience with the Party press has taught us to expect: in every instance, the figures given in the Daily Worker on the participants were distorted anywhere from twice to ten times the number that were actually on the scene. This sort of reporting has the worst possible consequences because it gives a misleading picture of the response of the working class, of the strength of the Party, and thereby perpetuates the basis for adventurism, and, in general, for policies all out of proportions to real conditions.

Achievements of Meetings

But when the outrageous falsifications of figures are wiped out, and the consideration is taken of the fact that for the first time in may years this May Day was almost everywhere organized as an open demonstration, frequently in the face of police terror or opposition (instead of, as formerly, in meeting halls), the participation was indicative of the increasingly radical mood of the working class. It may even be said that relative to the strength of the Communist Party, the demonstrations in the United States were superior to those in many, if not most of the European countries where, preliminary reports would indicate, the May Day demonstrations of the Communists were not at all up to the mark set in the past. Most certainly, they lacked the militancy that has characterized such meetings on previous occasions.

The demonstrations in the United States showed, at one and the same time, the weakness of the Party and its great possibilities. In New York, for instance, most obvious particularly as indicative of the organizational decline of the Party, was the falling off of its influence in the trade unions. The shoe workers, who formed one of the most impressive contingents in last year's demonstration, were represented by the barest handful this year. The food workers were to be remarked only by their fewness. In other trades and industries, an even worse picture was presented. And as a whole, the demonstration made evident the enormous gap that exists between the organizational strength of the Party and the possibilities for its growth and power, an ever-increasing gap which the destructive Party policy makes it extremely difficult to bridge. One neel go no further than the needle trades representation in the parade: In spite of the radical decline in organizational influence of the Party and Left wing in this industry, needle trades workers formed the largest group, many of them coming from Right wing shops. That the Party has lost in organizational influence over them is largely traceable to the incoherent policy of blunders it has pursued for the last period of time.

As for the much-tooted "mass political strike" ,it simply did not materialize. Not all the bluster of the Party press can conceal this damning fact. That the slogan was wrong and inappropriate for this period, that its use could result only in discrediting the slogan itself, was already clear when it was first promulgated. On May Day, the dispute was tested in life. The Daily Worker was unable to mention the name of a single factory or shop of any real importance throughout the United States which responded to the "mass political strike" slogan. As in so many other instances, the Party leaders are going through the regular process of self-exposure as irresponsible phrase-mongers.

Opposition Active

In all the demonstrations, the members of the Communist League (Opposition) participated actively in groups. The Party bureaucrats, as is known, followed a criminal course of ejecting our delegates from every "united front" May Day conference they controlled, issuing, at the same time, condemnations of the rank and file for "not organizing the united front conferences on a broad basis"! Needless to point out that this did not halt us in any instance from participating side by side with the revolutionary militants. As on May Day, we will continue to march with them, helping the workers in the Party to unload the crushing burden of stupid and criminal policies and an even worse leadership. The needs and possibilities of the movement, shown starkly on May Day, make this unburdening imperative.

Φ

ON THE NEEDLE TRADES

The next issue of the Militant will print an extended comment on the amazing statement "Building the Needle Trades Workers Union" which appeared in the Daily Worker on May 7, 1930.

Trotsky's Autobiography Free!

OR YOU CAN GET A FREE COPY OF

The Real Situation in Russia

This book is also available free of charge to all workers. Here you will find the only English translation of the famous Platform of the Russian Opposition, suppressed by Stalin, and Trotsky's letter exposing the falsifications of the History of the Russian revolution and the Communist Party. You will also find here the important Testament of Lenin. It is a $2.00 book but you can get it free from the Militant by turning in 5 yearly subscriptions (at $2.00 each) or 10 six-month subs (at $1.00 each). Renewals are accepted.

Do you want to get a copy, free of charge, of "My Life" by Leon Trotsky? Do you want to get the book which is arousing such enormous interest in the revolutionary movement in Europe and America? Many worker anxious to have it are unemployed. They can get it in spite of that. The Militant is offering a copy free to any worker who turns into its office TEN yearly subscriptions or TWENTY six-month subcriptions to the paper. Approach your friends and fellow workers. The sub for a year is $2.00; for six months it is $1.00. Collect the subs and the money, forward the mto the office, and get your copy of the Autobiography, which has been called Trotsky's greatest work, absolutely free of charge. This $5.00 book is yours for the little effort required to get the subs—or renewals.

WE ALSO OFFER A FREE COPY

Since Lenin Died

This book by Max Eastman was the first work in the English language to tell the truth about the struggle in the Russian Communist Party between the Opposition led by Trotsky, on the one hand, and Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bucharin, Stalin on the other. You will have an excellently drawn picture of the beginings of this fight after reading this book. The Militant has succeeded in getting the last few dozen copies of this book, of which no other edition exists. It has been sent to us from England, the American edition being exhausted. It sells for $1.00, but you can get it free of charge by turning in 3 yearly subs (at $2.00 each) or 6 six-month subs (at $1.00 each).

Send All Subscriptions and Funds to The Militant, 25 Third Ave., New York City

THE MILITANT, Vol. III, No. 19, May 10, 1930 Published weekly by the Com munist League of America (Opposition) at 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 centsper copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon, Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector, Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. (Total No. 44)

IN THE AMALGAMATED

Hillman and the Left Wing

This is the second of a series of articles on the situation in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the record of the Hillman Right wing administration, a criticism of the policies of the Left wing and the present tasks of the latter. The first of this series appeared in the last issue of the Militant, and the next one appearing next week will deal with the present regime in the union to which intellectuals of every stripe have sung such passionate songs of limitless praise. The series is of vital importance to all militants in every industry, and particularly to workers in the needle trades. By a regrettable error, the pen name of the author of this series, "A.Schneider" was omitted from last week's article.

After the 1921 lockout Hillman left for Russia for his vacation. During his absence from New York a serious situation developed in the New York organization.

"Harry Cohen, once manager of the Children's Clothing Joint Board, left the organization in 1920 and engaged in selling sewing material to the clothing employers. The union which was unattractive when private profits seemed in sight became attractive when the profits failed to materialize.

Capitalist Corruption in the Union

"In September 1921, H. Cohen announced his candidacy for office of manager of the Children's Clothing Departemnt of the New York Joint Board. H. Cohen was promptly informed by the General Office that his name would not be placed before the mem-gers to be voted on unless he cleared himself on certain charges. These charges involved checks which H. Cohen had received from employers of our members. But H. Cohen failed to appear before an investigation committee and opened fire upon the organization.

...."At the same time H. Cohen withdrew certain locals from the Joint Board and proclaimed himself boss of a separate union. After a few months fight H. Cohen was forced to appear before an investigation committee and explain his acts. The committee's unanimous verdict was, the act of any union official in borrowing money from manufactureres with whom the union has relations is, in the opinion of the committee, unethical and to be condemned. A man whose act of accepting financial favors at the hands of the employers of our members is unanimously condemned by an investigation committee, cannot hold any office in the A. C. W. A. The General Office took the position that in the labor movement purity must be even above unity. A labor organization that is unable to keep its hands clean does not deserve to live." (See the **Advance** editorial of Feb. 3, 1922, and the report of the investigation committee in the same issue pages 4-9 signed Morris Rothenberg, B.C. Vladeck, Charles W.Ervin. For other references see editorials. **Advance** of Dec. 19, 1921 and Jan. 13, 1922.)

During this fight the **Forward** and all those discredited leaders who were forced out of the union supported H. Cohen in his fight against the Amalgamated. They knew that if H. Cohen won they would be able to come back to the organization. But the investigation committee decided against H. Cohen and he withdrew temporarily.

The investigation committee also recommended to the Chicago convention a change in constitution in 1922 which states specifically in Article 13, Section 7 that people who have had dealings with employers are not eligible for office before the lapse of five years after their return to the trade. Did Hillman or Schlossberg live up to this clause in the constitution? No! Hillman, just as most chiefs, violated the constitution and still holds office, and H. Cohen, right after the Chicago convention was taken back into the union.

An interesting occurence at the Chicago convention was Hillamn's report of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation to help build clothing factories in Russia. The delegates unanimously approved his report with the exception of A. Beckerman who spoke against it. The "Left wing" so rejoiced over the approval of this report that they forgot to fight against standards of production and other "reforms". Hillman's going to Russia and the Russian-American Industrial Corporation was a manouver to bind the Lefts in order to introduce standards of production and reductions of wages. Hillman succeeded in fooling the Left wing.

Hillman Fools the Left

At the same time an unemployment situation developed in New York during 1921-22. Some of the old leaders who had left the union during 1919 and 1920—some of whom were forced out by the rank and file—utilized this situation for their own purposes while the Lefts were busy caucusing in the General Office with Rapchik, the lickspittle, and Salutsky-Hardman. Of course they organized with the aid of the **Forward,** and they threatened to split the New York organization and go back to the U. G. W. Hillman was faced with two possibilities: either to accept the challenge and make a fight against the clique with the aid of the progressives (or the Lefts) or to make peace with the **Forward** and take back the corrupt gang. Hillman chose to make peace with the **Forward** and its clique. He took back, in a quiet way, D. Wolff, Alex Cohen and Harry Cohen.

Not only did the Lefts not resist this treachery of Hillman, but local 5 under their leadership supported D. Wolff as manager of the N. Y. Joint Board! Hillman promised the Lefts that D. Wolff would carry through the Left policies in the union, and the Lefts took it for granted. Furthermore, the Lefts in local 5 called a meeting in Cooper Union and D. Wolff outlined the Left policies he would carry through in the union! It did not take long for the Left wing to find out that Wolff and Hillman had put them in a trap and double-crossed them. This shows how the Lefts allowed themselves to used as a tool by Hillman and his gang. The Lefts made a grave mistake by giving Hillman time to make peace with the fakers and the **Forward** clique whom the Left knew would do everything in their power to oust it from the organization. Will this be a lesson for the Left wing in the Amalgamated?

At the same time conditions in the industry became deplorable along with Hillman's policy of more production (which he called "efficiency" and reductions in wages (which he called "adjustments") to say nothing of reduction in working forces where workers were thrown out of the factories with the aid of the union.

Something had to be done to put a stop to this unbearable situation. So the local unions under the control of the progressives and the Lefts demanded certain reforms in the N. Y. organization: **1.** A minimum wage scale. **2.** An aggresive and constructive policy against "standards of production", reduction in wages, and reduction in working forces each season. **3.** Economy for the Joint Board, which meant reducing the staff. **4.** Amalgamation of the two Joint Boards (Children's and Men's clothing) and local unions. These demands were never carried into effect until the Amalgamatde officials were kicked into action by the fight the Left wing made.

Hillman's War on the Left

When Hillman saw the Lefts were determined to put up a fight for the reforms (or demands) and were gaining strength, he convinced himself at the Philadelphia convention in 1924 that the Right and Left wings were equal in numbers. Hillman and his General Executive Board made a gesture of "peace". Hillman declared that he belonged to neither group and what he wanted was "unity", which, in reality, meant the beginning of a bitter fight between the two factions. Hillman who didn't like to have a "Right or a Left" machine but always a Hillman machine, had to eliminate one of the groups in order to intrench himself. So after the Philadelphia "peace" convention Hillman with his Right wing **Forward** clique declared war against the progressives (or Lefts).

Furthermore, Hillman took in A. Beckerman, a person whom he always disliked, and made him manager of the New York Joint Board without an election. Hillman appointed Beckerman as manager because he knew Beckerman would do the "dirty work" against the Lefts. Who does not remember Beckerman with his gang which broke up meetings, black-jacked members, deprived workers of their jobs, or threw them out of their shops? Beckerman succeeded in crushing the Left wing and kept in submission the discontented workers. Not only were individual members expelled and ruthlessly blacklisted, but local unions, such as Local 5 of N. Y. and the Pressers local of Rochester, under trusted organizers like Harry Cohen and with the help of the underworld, were suspended and reorganized. Hillman, a shrewd politician, killed individual activity in order that his group should be kept in power.

Why were the Lefts defeated in the Amalgamated in a time when they controlled the largest local unions in N. Y. and half of the membership supported them throughout the country? This power was evident at the Philadelphia convention when the Right and Left wings had equal strength. As I pointed out: **1.** The Left gave Hillman time to make peace with the H. Cohen and the **Forward** clique. **2.** When the fight began they had the machinery in their own hands and it was easy for them to oust and expel the Left wing. **3.** The Left did not develop leadership able to cope with the situation. **4.** There was no unity among the Lefts; they fought among themselves instead of fighting the Hillman and Beckerman machine. **5.** They devoted much time to eliminating each other as leaders. In other words there wasn't one who could dominate or hold the group together. On the other hand the Hillman clique had the whole machinery in their control. They had the bosses, the police, the gangsters, the cash, and above all they were united to crush the progressives, or the Lefts. They have succeeded temporarily.

The question is: Have the Lefts learned the lesson from their past mistakes? This can not be answered off hand. For one thing the isolation policy the Communist Party officials have lately adopted will not bring any results.

What Must Be Done

In order to change the present intolrable conditions of the Amalgamated members something must be done. Conferences should be held in every clothing center. The Left wing should unite with progressive workers, and put responsible leadership in every city to carry through the work. An educational campaign should be waged throughout the country to bring before every local union in the U.S. and Canada the following demands: **1.** All expelled members to be taken back to the organization with full membrship rights. **2.** No discriminations against political affiliations. **3.** Elections should be held in every city and the members should decide who should represent them. **4.** A 40-hour week should be established all over the country with week work. **5.** To do away with piece work and "standards of production". **6.** A minimum wage scale for all operations. **7.** Unemployment insurance to be paid by the bosses and controlled by the workers. New York must take the lead in this fight because the loss of New York was decisive in the defeat of the Lefts throughout the country.

I know the Amalgamated bureaucrats will not accept these demands. What is important, however, is that with the help of the progressive workers, and with a constant agitation, the masses will rally behind the Left wing. When the next battle between the Left wing and the Hillman machine occurs, the Lefts and the progressives, united and not isolated, will come out victorious.

Stalinist Splitting

Bordiga Expelled

Il Lavoratore, organ of the Italian fraction of the Party, has just announced the decision of the Italian Communist Party Executive to expel comrade Amadeo Bordiga, on the charges of leading the Left Opposition and supporting "Trotskyism". The expulsion of the most capable leader of Communism in Italy is one of the most irresponsible and severe blows yet struck at the Party by its own leadership.

Comrade Bordiga is the founder of the Italian Communist movement. When about nine-tenths of the present leadership of the Italian Party were still either in the camp of the social democracy or hesitating about the formation of a Communist Party and a break with the yellow leaders of the Socialist party and the Federation of Labor, Bordiga was leading the struggle to found the Party from which he has now been expelled. He was the principle spokesman of the Left wing at the famous Livorno Congress of the Socialist Party in 1921, and was the acknowledged leader of the Communist Party after the Congress split.

In 1923, Zinoviev manipulated the executive of the Italian Party in order to remove the Bordiga group from leadership, even though a subsequent vote showed ninety percent of the Party to support the Left, and practically the entire Youth Federation. The coup d'Etat of the Centrists and Righ wingers in the Party was finally achieved at the Lyons Congress in1926, where the most outrageous gerrymandering and mis-counting of votes enabled them to cinch their control. Not only was the vote of Bordiga's own local Party group officially recorded against him at the Congress, but even the vote of Bordiga himself!

In November of the same year, comrade Bordiga was imprisoned by the fascist regime for being a Communist and exiled to the island of Ustica, between Sicily and Naples in the Mediterranean Sea. Only on the occasion of the recent "amnesty" were he and a number of other comrades released —only to be kept under the mist rigid surveillance by the fascist police.

Not daring to expel Bordiga as a "counter-revolutionary" while he was in fascist exile, the opportunist leaders of the Party, fearful of the great influence comrade Bordiga would exert in the ranks of the Party took the desperate measure of expulsion. It is unnecessary to add that this will do anything but prevent the progress of the Left Opposition in the Italian Party.

That the expulsion will not pass by without serious repercussions in the ranks of the Italian Commnists in all parts of the world, goes without saying. The first reports we have already received in New York indiiate a strong resentment in the ranks of the Italian Party members against the expulsion. We are confident that many of these comrades, as well as revolutionary workers outside of the Party, will make their voices heard in protest against this criminal act of the Italian Stalinists.

—X.

Φ

"MY LIFE"

All readers of the Militant, and their friends, who desire to get their copy of of Leon Trotsky, "My Life", should make it a point to order the bokk directly through the Militant. Shipment will be made the day the order is received, and the cost of the book, five dollars, ($5.00), covers the postage charge. Send your order, together with money order or cash to

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Φ

SAN FRANCISCO—Oscar Lilgeholm, 75, ran out of money and was too old to get a job. He dug himself a rough cave in yolden Gate Park, San Francisco, and had lived there for two weeks before starvation drove him out. Two boys found him half unconscious and begging for water.

A Visit to the Island of Prinkipo

Prinkipo is the old Greek name for the Isle of Princes, about two hours by boat from Constantinople. It was given this name because princes of the ancient realm who incurred the displeasure of the ruling autocrat were dispatched to the tiny island in the Sea of Marmora as exiles and prisoners. The nationalistic Turks, having overthrown the yoke of Greek domination, proceeded to remove all relics of that hated regime even to the extent of changing the old Greek names: Constantinople has become Stambul, and the Isle of Princes has become Buyuk-Ada, or Grand Island.

The name of the island has been changed but it remains a place of exile. There is no longer a single prince imprisoned on it. But for that the island is now reserved for a different kind of exile, for the Bolshevik who has incurred the displeasure of the ruling regime in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. By gentlemanly arrangement between Stalin and Kemal Pasha, Buyuk-Ada has become the fourth place of exile for Leon Trotsky, his wife and son.

Trotsky's Health

We did not visit comrade Trotsky as a newspaper correspondent seeking sensations and so we have no journalistic sensations to report. As it is, there are plenty of reporters and writers who knock on the door every other day to ask: "May I see M. Trotsky about his views on religion?" or "What does M. Trotsky think of modern art?" or "Will M. Trotsky write a reply for us to Floyd Gibbons' 'Red Napoleon'? or "Can we get a statement here on the report that M. Trotsky is on his death bed?" or any number of similar questions. Yet, out of all these personal questions, so to say, the one about his health recurs most frquently; there have been so many conflicting reports on this point that it will be worth while to state matters accurately.

Comrade Trotsky is not on his death bed, that goes without saying. He is usually quite vigorous and works with customary diligence. Unfortunately, the accumulation of certain maladies, made more acute by his exile in Alma-Ata and the absence of proper medical attention, makes him subject from time to time to malarial attacks and headaches of some severity, gout, and most alarming of all, to trouble with his heart. What is needed is treatment by a specialist as well as a climate and environment for a cure. Thus far, every effort has been made to prevent him from obtaining the necessary attention. It has been a concerted effort of Stalin and Kemal Pasha on the one hand, and all the bourgeois countries of Europe "democracies" and dictatorships, on the other. The much-advertized right of asylum is obviously extended to the Bessodovskys but not to Bolsheviks.

During our brief stay, we talked at some length about the situation in Russia and about the movement in the United States. Trotsky had just finished writing his articles on the new course in Soviet economy and the prospects for the Five Year plan. Just about the same time, the news began to arrive from Russia reporting the latest turn begun by Stalin towards the moderation of the Plan. The question arose: How is it that Stalin, and even Bucharin of late, after having conducted a furious campaign for years against the Opposition by accusing it of being "super-industrialist", finally adopted and began to carry out a plan for industrialization and collectivization which, at least on the face of it, was far more radical than any previously proposed by the Opposition? Comrade Trotsky explained it in this way:.

Stalin and the Five Year Plan

The requirements of the economic situation that developed in the country after the presentation of the Platform and Counter theses of the Opposition, and the latter's subsequent expulsion from the Party, soon demanded the formulation of a much more radical and far-reaching program than had originally been conceived. The Centrist faction of Stalin, which had first adopted the timid and worthless plan of Rykov, rejected it under the pressure of the situation and proceeded with a Five Year plan of considerably greater breadth. The startling successes of the first year—startling to the Centrists who never really believed such a rapid tempo possible—not only demonstrated the enormous latent possibilities for industrial development undr a proletarian dictatorship (nationalization of industry, banks, etc., etc.), but immediately produced an extreme boldness born precisely out of Centrism's previous timidity. Almost overnight, the initial successes of the Plan gave rise to the wildest kind of exaggerations. The Kulak was going to be liquidated as a class. The Five Year Plan was to be realized in four years—or three and a half, or three as some said. Agrarian collectivization was now definitely accomplished in half of Russia. The N. E. P. was to be abolished. Socialism was being completed in isolated Russia. These were only a few—and among the mildest—exaggerations contained in the Soviet press, and repeated in the official Communist press abroad. The achievements of the first year were utilized to "prove" that the entire Opposition platform was bankrupt, the previous accusations of "super-industrialism" were converted into "Trotskyist pessimism", and on these foundations, a number of capitulations were realized out of the ranks of the Left.

But the very first signs of difficulties transformed the cocksure braggarts of Centrism back again into timid, cautious bureaucrats. The rapid pace of collectivization and industrialization ran its head into the brick wall of a proletarian state isolated in a sea of capitalist world economy, proving not in abstract theory but in cold practise, the absolutely untenable position of Stalin's and Bucharin's theory of national socialism. A crisis began to develop in agriculture, exactly along the lines indicated by the Opposition. Stalin forthwith sounded the retreat. So long as uninterrupted progress had been made, Stalin sedulously cultivated what he now, when obstacles were encountered, sought to unburden responsibility for: "Dizziness of success".

The Danger of a Retreat

That a retreat was necessary was already evident. It was already proposed by comrade Trotsky to ward off an impending crisis in the country, the danger of which is by no means averted yet. At the same time he raised a warning against the retreat going too far. It now becomes increasingly clear that Stalin who is on the road leading away from the recent ultra-Left zig-zag in Russia will not come to a halt until he has reached the other extreme and accepted the original program of the Right wing. That is now the great danger in the Russian situation.

It is equally clear that Stalin will not be able to gain the support of the whole Party for this new bureaucratic turn about face. In the zig-zag to the Left, mass forces were of necessity unleashed which it will not be easily possible to put in chains again. The proletarian core of the Party will resist the sharp turn to the Right which has already begun. That is why comrade Trotsky spoke with the greatest confidence of the re-formation of a strong Left Opposition inside the Communist Party.

It is in connection with the big journalistic bluff and exaggerations about the Five Year Plan and the capitulation of many Oppositionists who pleaded the "successes of socialist construction" as their pretext for leaving the Opposition, that a humorous but pointed conversation took place. A copy of the New York Nation had arrived one morning, containing an article, "Russia's New Revolution", written by Louis Fischer, one of the innumerable liberal journalists commuting between New York and Moscow and earning a livelihood by writing publicity for the Stalin faction.

We showed Trotsky a passage in the article which read: "Stalin's ultra-radical, revolutionary policy has won the hearts of the Trotskyists, and they have come rushing back from Siberian, Caucasion and Volgan exile to participate in the pressing business of reconstruction. They have come back humbly, with clipped wings, acknowledging Stalin's talents and Trotsky's mistakes... Stalin, my ex-Trotskyist friends tell me, had done more than they wanted of him, and more even than they expected of Trotsky."

"You see," we said jokingly while Trotsky was scanning the paragraph, "everybody is saying that Stalin has gone much further than you ever proposed."

"That's true," he replied immediately. "When a man has a boil on his neck, a capable surgeon will simply lance the boil. A shoemaker will go much further and sever the man's head from his shoulders. Yes, there is no doubt that Stalin has also gone 'much further' than I proposed!"

—And the capitulators? Would they play any considerable hole in the resurgence of the Opposition within the Party? Comrade Trotsky does not believe they will.

"The revolution is a great devourer of people," he said. "It has burned out these men, used them up, exhausted them. They cannot even play an important part in the Centrist faction. It must not be forgotten that these men are not newcomers in the movement. On the contrary. Many of them have gone through two, three revolutions. They spent a large part of their lives in czarist prisons and exiles. They were the militants who organized and led the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 and for years afterwards. They passed through the rigorous years of the civil war and intervention then through the period of reaction after the death of Lenin, and finally through prison or exile under Stalin. They have lived through the intensest years of history. Very few have come out of them unscathed to one degree or another. The others have been burned out or the revolutionary fires in them quenched.

The "Old Bolsheviks"

Of course this phenomenon is chiefly noticeable and widespread in the ranks of the ruling apparatus. Trotsky mentioned one name after another of comrades in the most prominent Party and Soviet positions, all of them imbued with the profoundest hatred for the "permanent revolution". That formula runs against the grain of every self-contented bureaucrat who has squeezed his bottom firmly into a chair after the consolidation of the revolution's initial victories. All of thm have sought to put themselves beyond criticism by the religious title of "Old Bolsheviks" or the "Old Guard". Yet the overwhelming majority of the members of the present Central Committee of the Russian Party are men who, inside or outside of Lenin's Party before the revolution, never went beyond the conception of revolutionary democrats or Mensheviks. Trotsky recounted an incident which adequately characterizes the "Old Bolshevism" of nine-tenths of the present Party spokesmen.

It was during a meeting of the Party Central Control Commission, where Trotsky was being "tried" and his "non-Bolshevik past" brought out against him. During his speech, he quoted from an issue of the **Social Democrat**, a journal edited and published in Yakutsk **jointly** by the Mensheviks and a number of now prominent "Old Bolsheviks": Ordjonikidze, Petrovsky (of the Ukraine), and the peerless Yaroslavsky. This paper was issued not in 1905, nor in 1912 or 1914, but in 1917, after the Kerensky revolution and on the eve of the October uprising!

He read from some of the articles written by these "old Guardsmen", all of which were penetrated by the most vulgar kind of bourgeois democratic notions conceivable. The Kerensky revolution—if only it would introduce a few reforms—was hailed as the great people's democratic government. When Trotsky mentioned the trio of "Bolsheviks" who wrote these articles, there was a sensation even in the Control Commission. Yaroslavsky tried to bluster and bluff it out, but the blunter Ordjonikidze simply replied: "Well, what of that? We wrote lots of stupid things in those days."

"Yes," said Trotsky, "but I would let my arms and legs be cut off and my head taken from my shoulders if in all of my writings you could find anything half so bad as this!" A little while later, the copy of the paper from which Trotsky had quoted, which he had found after considerabl effort, was stolen from his room. The Yaroslavskies, so meticulous about the literary records, real and forged, of comrade Trotsky, had no intention of letting their own shameful records lie around where Oppositionists could make use of them. Fortunately, the protocol of the Control Commission still records the damning excerpts—unless that too has been put into the furnace reserved for everything embarrassing to the Stalinist regime! It is precisely such types that are now doing the job of corrupting a whole generation of revolutionists with their shoddy substitute for Leninism.

* * *

A considerable part of our conversation was devoted to the situation in the United States and the perspectives for the movement here. He asked about very detail of our work, our numerical strength, the circulation of the Militant, our work in the trade unions, the influence of the Party, the strength of the Lovestone faction, etc., etc. The establishment of the weekly Militant, which he follows closely, he considers the greatest achievement of the American Opposition. When we spoke of the difficulties of the paper, to which every labor and revolutionary journal is subject, he even wrote to the American comrades urging that the greatest efforts be exerted to maintain and strengthen the weekly.

On the "Farmer-Labor Party"

Trotsky does not know the American situation as well as he does, let us say, the Russian, or even the French, but he is very far from being unacquainted with it. Of the American Party leaders, he is "best" acquainted with Pepper. He told of how Pepper came to him during the days of the great "farmer-labor party boom" in the United States, and tried to convince him that the revolution in this country would come about by winning over the revolutionary farmers, allying the Communist Party with the petty bourgeoisie and neutralizing the working class! The question of a farmer-labor party (i. e., a party of two classes) had come up then for the first time in the Political Bureau of the Party in Moscow. Everybody spoke hesitantly or tentatively about it. Stalin even said: "I am sure that if Vladimir Ilyitch were present he would be for it." Trotsky intervened immediately and spoke sharply and at length against the whole idea. Kamenev who has a flair for the Left in a theoretical discssion, picked up the thread right away and as a result of the subsequent decision, the American Party was, in part at least, dragged by the hair out of the opportunist swamp into which Pepper had led it.

Trotsky outlined—we repeat them here briefly—his ideas of the perspectives for developments in this country. "In my work on the Russian revolution of 1905," he said, "I remarked on the fact that Marx had written that capitalism passes from feudalism to the guild system to the factory. In Russia, however, we never knew the guild system, with the possible exception of the 'kustari'. Or one might compare the development of the working class in England and Germany with that in Russia. In the first two countries, the proletariat has gone through a long period of parliamentary experience. In Russia, on the other hand, there was very little of a parliamentary system for the workers. That is, the Russian proletariat learned its parliamentary history from an abridged handbook.

"In many respects, the history of the development of th United States is akin to that of the Russian working class. It is nowhere written, and theoretically it cannot be substantiated, that the American workers will perforce have to pass thruogh the school of reformism for a long period of time. They live and develop in another period, their coming to maturity is taking place under different circumstances than that of the English working class, for instatue,. That is, the stage of a labor party or a powerful socialist party is by no means **inevitable.** The rapidity of the development of the American workers, of course, also depends to a large extent upon the degree of preparedness of the Communist movement and its clairty. The socialist party in the United States need by no means

Internationalism and the Theory of «Exceptionalism»

By L. D. TROTSKY

PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION OF "THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION"

As this book goes to press in the English language, the whole thinking part of the internationaal working class and in a sense—the whole of "civilized" humanity, listens with particularly keen interest to the resoundings of the economic turn taking place on the major part of the former czarist empire. The greatest attention in this connection is aroused by the problem of collectivizing the peasant holdings. And no wonder: in this sphere the break with the past assumes a particularly absorbing character. But a correct evaluation of collectivization is unthinkable without a general conception of the socialist revolution. And here again, but already on a higher stage, we convince ourselves that in the sphere of Marxian theory there is nothing unrelated to practical activity. The most remote, and it would seem, "abstract" disagreements, if they are thought out to the end, will sooner or later always appear in practice, and this latter will not forgive a single theoretical mistake.

The collectivization of peasant holdings is, it is understood, a necessary and essential part of the socialist transformation of society. The volume and tempo of collectivization, however, is not only determined by the government's will but, in the final analysis by the economic factors: by the height of the country's economic level, the correlation between industry and agriculture and

.....

and will by no means ever reach the position of the British Labor Party or the German social democracy

"It is not at all permanently established that the United States will be last in the order of revolutionary primacy, condemned to reach its proletarian revolution only after the countries of Europe and Asia. A situation, a combination of forces is possible in which the order is changed and the tempo of development in the United States enormously accelerated. But for that it is necessary to prepare".

It is the task of the Left Opposition to aid in this preparation, to set the revolutionary movement in the United States upon the path indicated by the guide we already have in Marxist thought ,enriched and verified by the experiences of modern history.

* * *

On the train leaving Paris, after the conclusion of the international conference of the Opposition we unexpectedly came face tof ace with an American comrade still a member of the Party, who was returning to the States. We spoke of the trip to Turkey and he told us confidentially of a conversation he had had a little while ago with Eisenstein, the well-known Russian movie director who was then in Paris. Eisenstein had directed the film "Ten Days That Shook the World", a record of the October uprising in Russia. As is quite natural, Lenin and Trotsky—that is, actors taking their parts—featured prominently in most of the scenes. When the film was shown in the United States, many comrades will recall that while Lenin was to be seen, there was not a sign of Trotsky throughout the picture. To all the intents and purposes of that picture, Trotsky might have been in South Africa when the Russian revolution took place. What had happened between the time of the original production and its public showings? Eisenstein told my friend the story:

He was called in to the office of the Sovkino (the Russian film trust) and the chairman said to him: "Eisenstein, art is art, but politics is politics. And you'll have to cut Trotsky out of the picture!" That is how "Ten Days That Shook the World" was saved from the menace of Trotskyism.

That is another task of the Opposition, a task which is part and parcel of the work of preparing the revolutionary Marxists not only in the United States but everywhere else: To re-tell th true history of the Russian revolution, to excavate the truth from nder the garbage of filthy lies with which the apparatus men have covered it for without an accurate knowledge of the past and what it has to teach us, there will never be an adequate prparation for our future.—M. S.

consequently by the technical rsources of industry itself.

Industrialization and Socialism

Industrialization is the moving factor of the whole newest culture and, by that itself, the single plausible basis of socialism. In the conditions of the Soviet Union industrialization means first of all the strengthening of the base of the proletariat as a ruling class. Simultaneously it creates the material-technical pre-condition for the collectivization of agriculture. The tempos of both these processes are interdependent. The proletariat is interested in the highest tempo for both processes, in so far as the new society that is being created can thus guard itself best from external danger, and at the same time create a source for the systematic raising of the material level of the toiling masses.

However, the tempos that can be accomplished are limited by the general material and cultural level of the country, by the mutual relationship between the city and village and in the pressing needs of the masses, who can sacrifice their today for the sake of tomorrow, **only within certain limits.** The optimum, that is the best, most advantageous tempos are those that give swift development to industry not only for the given moment, but secure the necessary stability of the social order of the dictatorship, that is, first of all the strengthening of the unity of the workers and peasants, preparing by that itself the possibility of further successes.

From this point of view the general historical criterion from the angle of which the party and government leadership directs the economic development in a planned order is of decisive significance. Here two basic variations ar possible: **a.** the course described above of economic strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship in a single country until further victories of the internatinoal porletarian revolution (the viewpoint of the Left Opposition); **b.** the course of constructing an isolated national socialist society, and that "in the shortest historical time" (the present official viewpoint).

These are two absolutely different, and in the final analysis, contrary theoretical conceptions of socialism. From them flow a different strategy and different tactics.

In the limits of this preface we cannot consider anew the question of building socialism in one country. Other of our works are devotd to this particularly "The Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern".* Here we limit ourselves to the most basim elements of the question. Let us recall, first of all, that the theory of socialism in one country was first formulated by Stalin in the Fall of 1924, in complete contradiction not only to the whole tradition of Marxism and the school of Lenin, but even to what Stalin wrote in the Spring of that same year, 1924. From the standpoint of principle the abandonment of Marxism by the Stalinist "school" in the question of socialist construction is no less significant than, for example, the break of the German Social Dmocracy with Marxism in the question of war and patriotism, in the Fall of 1914, that is exactly ten years before the Stalinist turn. This comparison has no accidental character. Stalin's "mistake," as well as the "mistake" of the German Social-Democracy is **national-socialism.**

Marxism and World Economy

Marxism follows from world economy, not as a sum of national parts, but as a mighty independent reality, which is created by the international division of labor and by the world market, dominating powerfully in the present epoch over national markets. The productive forces of capitalist society have long ago outgrown national limits. The imperialist war was one of the expressions of this fact. In the productive-technical respect socialist society must represent a higher stage compared to capitalism. To aim at the construction of a **nationally-enclosed** socialist society would mean, in spite of all temporary successes, to pull the productive forces backward even as compared to capitalism. To attempt independent of geographic cultural and historical conditions of the country's development, making up a part of the world's whole, to realize a self-sufficient proportionality of all the branches of economy in a national frame, means to pursue a reactionory utopia. If the heralds and supporters of this theory nevertheless participate in the international revolutionary struggle (with what success—is a different question), it is because as hopeless eclectics, they mechanically combine abstract internationalism with reactionary-utopian-socialism. The most finished expression of this eclecticism is the program of the Comintern adopted at the Sixth Congress.

To expose completely one of the main theoretical mistakes, lying at the base of the national-socialist conception, we can do nothing better than to quote the recently published speech of Stalin, devoted to the internal questions of American Communism.** "It would be wrong," says Stalin against one of the American factions, "not to take into consideration the specific peculiarities of American capitalism. The Communist Party must consider them in its work. But it would be still more wrong to base the activity of the Communist Party on these specific features, for the foundation of activity of every Communist Party, the American included, on which it must base itself, are the **common features** of capitalism the **same** basically **for all countries,** and not the specific features in the given country. **It is not on this that the internationalism of the Communist Parties exists.** The specific features are merely **supplementary** to the general features." (Bolshevik, Number 1, 1930, page 8, emphasis ours.)

These lines leave nothing to be desired in the way of clarity. Under the guise of giving an economic foundation to internationalism, Stalin gives in reality the foundation of national-socialism. It is false that the specific features are "merely **supplementary** to the general features" like a wart or a face. In reality the national peculiarities are an original unity of the basic features of the world process. This originality may have a decisive significance for the revolutionary strategy for years. It is sufficient to recall the fact that the proletariat of a backward country has come to power many years before the proletariat of the advanced countries. This one historic lesson shows that in spite of Stalin, it is absolutely wrong to base the activity of the Communist Parties on some **"common** features", that is on the abstract type of national capitalism. It is false to the roots that it is on this "that the internationalism of the Communist Parties exists." In reality it exists on the inconsistency of a national state, which has long outlived itself, and acts as a brake on the development of the productive forces. National capitalism not only cannot be reconstructed, but cannot even be conceived of as anything but a part of world economy.

The economic peculiarities of different countries is not of a secondary character: It is enough to compare England and India, the United States and Brazil. But the specific features of national economy, no matter how big, enter, and that in an increasing measure with their component parts into the higher reality, which is called world economy, and on which, in the final analysis, the internationalism of the Communist Parties is founded.

The Law of Uneven Development

Stalin's characterization of the national peculiarities, as a simple "supplement" to the common type, is in crying and by no means accidental contradiction to Stalin's understanding (that is, his lack of understanding) of the law of the uneven development of capitalism. This law, as is known, is declared by Stalin as basic, most important and universal. With the help of the law of uneven deveolpment, turned by him into an abstraction, Stalin attempts to solve all the riddles of existence. But it is shocking: he does not notice that **national originality is the most common and, so to say, summed-up product of the uneven historic development.** It is only necessary to understand this unevenness correctly, to take it in its full measure, extending it also to the pre-capitalist past. A faster or slower development of productive forces; an extended or, on the contrary, a contracted character of whole historic epochs: for example, of the middle ages, the guild system, enlightened absolutism, parliamentarism; the uneven development of the different branches of economy, different classes, different social institutions, different sides of culture—all these lie at the basis of national "peculiarities". Originality of a national-social type is the crystallization of the unevenness of its formation. The October revolution arose, as one of the grandest manifestations of the uneveness of the historic process. The theory of the permanent revolution, which gave the **prognosis** of the October overturn, supported itself, by that alone, on the law of uneven historic development, not in its abstract form, but in its material crystallization, in the form of the social and political originality of Russia.

Stalin introduced the law of uneven development not in order opportunely to foresee the seizure of power by the proletariat of a backward country, but in order after the fact, in 1924 to hang on to the victorious proletariat the task of constructing a national socialist society. But it is precisely here that the law of uneven development has nothing to do with the matter, for it does not substitute and does not remove the laws of world economy; on the contrary, it is subordinated to them.

Fetishizing the law of uneven development, Stalin declares it sufficient as a basis for national-socialism, not as a type that is common to all countries, but exceptional, Messianic, purely Russian. To construct an independent socialist society is possible, according to Stalin, only in Russia. By this alone he puts the national peculiarities of Russia not only above the "commmon features" of all the capitalist nations, but also above world economy as a whole. Here is where the fatal gap opens in the whole of Stalin's conception. The originality of the U. S. S. R. is so mighty that it makes possible the construction of its own socialism within its limits, independent of what may happen with the rest of humanity. As for other countries to which the Messianic seal has not been affixed, their originality is only "supplementary" to the common features, only a wart on the face. "It would be wrong," Stalin teaches, "to base the activities of the Communist Parties on these specific features." This moral holds good for the American Communist Party, the British South African and Serbian, but...not for the Russian, whose activity is based not on the "common features", but precisely on the "peculiarities". From here flows the dual strategy of the Comintern throughout: while the U. S. S. R. "liquidates the classes" and constructs national socialism, the proletariat of all the other countries, completely independent of actual national conditions, is obligated to simultaneous action according to the calendar (First of August, March Sixth, etc.). Messianic nationalism is supplemented by bureaucratically-abstract internationalism. This duality runs through the whole program of the Comintern, depriving it of any kind of principled significance.

If we take England and India as two different poles of capitalist types, we must state that the internationalism of the British and Hindu proletariat does not at all rest on the **sameness** of conditions, tasks and methods, but on their unbreakable **mutual dependence.** The successes of the liberation movement in India require a revolutionary movement in England, and the other way around. Neither in India, nor in England is it possible to construct an independent socialist society. Both of them will have to enter as parts into a higher whole. In this and only in this is the uncrushable foundation of Marxian internationalism.

(To Be Continued)

** This speech was delivered on May 6, 1929, was first published at the beginning of 1930, and under such circumstances that it acquires a "programmatic" significance.

Character and Limits of Our Faction

Lessons from Recent International Experiences of the Opposition

By James P. Cannon

The American movement is condemned by its position, geographically, and politically to lag behind events in the International. This has been demonstrated with an almost arithmetical precision during the entire decade of the existence of the Comintern. The developments in the Russian and West European Parties have always been registered in our own—a few years later. This was the case regarding the crisis in the Russian Party and the Comintern. We were one of the latest detachments of the International Communist Opposition to take definite shape in the open just as the Lovestone group is a somewhat belated reinforcement in the rear of the International right wing. Neither of these American factions, however found its International connection by accident. We were "prepared by the past" for our place under the banner of the International Left Opposition. Lovestone and Co. served their apprenticeship and became journeyman opportunists, qualified for union with Brandler, in the American Party struggles.

The protracted period of our gestation as a faction on the line of the Bolshevik-Leninists has not been without compensating advantages. The rich experiences of the International struggle were realized for us, as it were in advance, and we have been able to build on their foundations. This insured for us a clearer perspective and tactical line.

On the one hand our deductions from international experience enabled us to avoid a false attitude toward the Party and an over-ambitious program for the creation of a new one; on the other hand they were a shield against the capitulation panic. This sickness, which periodically attacked the Opposition movements in the other countries, was never a problem for us. Three or four weak and inconsequential people at the most, who found themselves in our ranks by mistake, denounced themselves as renegades as soon as they found that membership in the Opposition meant a hard fight.

That was all. One strives with difficulty to recall their names—so little influence did they exert on our cause.

Internationalism our Touchstone

This careful attentiveness to International development which has served us in such good stead all along should mark our deliberations now as we prepare to raise our struggle to a higher ground. In contradistinction to the opportunists, Internationalism is the touch-stone of our faction. But this does not assure for us the automatic assimilation of International experience. Continuous study of our problems in their international aspect is necessary now as before if we are to draw the correct inferences. Recent experiences in the International movement, particularly in Germany and France, should be the occasion for study and discussion in our ranks. And from this must follow a firmer consolidation of our ideological position and a strengthening of our tactical line in the struggle for the proletarian sections of the Party and Left wing.

In the light of recent events in the camp of the International Left three questions present themselves with especial insistence. They are: **1.** The character and limits of our fraction; **2.** Our attitude toward the Party and the Party bureaucrats; **3.** Our attitude toward the Right wing. Developments in the American Party since our National Conference also serve to push these questions into the foreground.

We proceed from the point of view that the crisis in the Comintern arises from the reaction against the October revolution and the weakening of the position of the revolutionary movement on an International scale. This crisis has split the Comintern into three factions, and the character of these factions becomes clearer every day. The issues were obscured for a long time. The exceptional position of the official Centrists, their monopoly of the apparatus and of unlimited material resources, gave them unprecedented opportunities for suppression, falsification and corruption. These methods were utilized to the limit. "Six years were necessary," says Trotsky, "in order to bring the weightiest questions and differences out of the bureaucratic underworld into the world arena." But political logic is stronger than bueraucratic machinations. It has forced the ideas, and the struggle over them, into the open.

This struggle for us is a struggle for the October revolution and for the principles embodied in it and in the first four Congresses of the Communist International. It is a principle fight for the foundations of Leninism. The International Left wing alone defends these positions. That is the reason, and the only reason, we were expelled by the bloc of the Right wing and the Centrists. It is obivous that such a fight can be ended only with victory.

The question then arises: how can this fight be waged successfully?

The answer is: in the first place, by a clear and definite principle line on all questions; in the second place, by the firm organization of a faction **on the basis of principle;** and, in the third place, by an intransigeant struggle for these principles under all circumstances and through all fluctuations in the movement. Lenin taught these lessons positively—through the long struggle and final victory of the Bolsheviks by these methods; the German Leninbund has taught them negatively—through its disintegration and degeneration by the rejection of them.

The Left wing is not a Party **but a faction fighting to win the Party.** The Leninbund stumbled on this question. Mistaking the corrupted bureaucrats for the proletarian masses in the Party ranks it set out toward the formation of a new party. In order to bet numbers quickly it assembled heterogenous elements. Instead of defining and sharpening its principle line it blunted it. The Leninbund admitted people who had all kinds of "grievances" against the Party but had no common basis in principle. It maintained relations with anti-Marxists and speculated on a bloc with the Right wing against the Party. The result: a false attitude on fundamental questions, the steady decline of a promising proletarian movement, a miserable degeneration culminating in a split.

The lesson for us in this event is the organization of our faction on principle lines only. Our strength as a faction, is our platform. Numbers will follow from that, not precede it. The Right wing attacks this insistence on close principle unity as "sectarianism". That is because their aims are different than ours. Opportunism has always made allowance for all kinds of divergent tendencies—except the proletarian revolutionary tendency. Lovestone freed by his expulsion from obligations to Communist tradition, is appealing for recruits on this basis. Anyone can join the Right wing and still "have the right to think and freedom to "express" themselves" one way or the opposite. This is the Right wing "inducement" to prospective members.

We can have nothing in common with these conceptions. We stand for Party democracy because a living party can determine its united will only through democratic forms. But the democracy we advocate is a **centralized** democracy, that is to say, a form for a Party of action, not a mere discussion club for the exchange of ideas. A Party of action, thus governed, must have definite organization limits. These limitations have a double application for a faction.

The Limits of a Faction

Lenin prescribed strict limits of principle for membership in the Party, **and still narrower limits for a fraction.** The sneers of the "Revolutionary Age" against the "sectarianism" of Trotsky's advice to the members of the Leninbund is characteristic of opportunists. Lenin, in justifying the expulsion of the Otzovists (boycottists) from the Bolshevik faction, elucidated the question as follows:

"As a faction, i. e., as a union of those who think alike in the Party, we cannot work without unity on fundamental questions. To break away from a fraction is not the same as breaking away from the Party. Those who have left our fraction are by no means deprived of the possibility of working in the Party." (Liquidating the Liquidators.)

The wisdom of this point of view is confirmed by all revolutionary experience. In order for a Party to lead the proletariat to victory it must have a clearly defined program and organization limits. A revolutionary faction must draw still closer lines. Otherwise it will not be able to act unitedly and influence the Party. It will be lost in the current of events instead of helping to shape them. We will not measure up to our historic mission if we forget the lessons.

As a group of Communists convinced of our platform and confident of our future, we have no need to boast of accomplishmens or to exaggerate our present influence. We know that the political line will decide and that the numerical ratio at the moment means little in the final analysis. But it is already clear that the Opposition, in spite of the heaviest obstacles, is going forward. In less than a year after our expulsion we succeeded in uniting our forces in a National Conference and adopting a platform. In less than a year since our Conference a new layer of Oppositionists is assembling in the Party. Our unrelenting fight on principle lines is shaping this development. The progress in the next priod and our whole future depend on our continued adherence to this intransigeant line of struggle.

Our platform is the platform of Leninism. The principled character of our faction and its definite organizational limits are the Leninist methods of organization. The slogan of intransigeance in principle questions is the slogan for Bolshevik struggle and victory. The late experiences in the camp of the International Left wing, if properly assimilated, can only strengthen and reinforce our positions on this ground.

From this the question of our future attitude toward the Party and Party bureaucrats, and to the Right wing is easy to decide. These are subjects for subsequent articles.

« The Case of Roy Stephens »

The assault upon the former Boston organizer of the Party and present adherent of the Lovestone faction, Roy Stephens, by a Central Committee directed slugging squad, adds another black page to the list of Fascist attacks by which the Stalinist regime in the movement threatens to discredit Communism for years in the eyes of the whole working class. The beating up of Party political opponents, organized onslaughts upon public meetings, burglarizing private homes and robbing documents, are essentially fascist methods, and there is little if anything to distinguish them when they are used by black-shirts or Stalinists.

Tactics Copied from Fascism

Indeed, it is from the grusome chapters of fascism that all of these methods have been copied by the Stalinist usurpers and introduced as an alien body into our movement. The whole Communist movement fought these methods when the desperate yellow socialists and A. F. of L. fakers applied them in the trade unions in order to stem the tide of progressive and Left wing influence. The same tactics deserve not one ounce more of approval when they are applied by the Stalinist bureaucracy against any of the political groups in the movement be they of the Left wing or the Right wing. These methods bring only the most negative results. They are a contemptible abuse of what little "power" the Party bureaucrats have at their command.

We condemned these methods when they were first used against our group. We do not forget for an instant that the first faction to use them was the Lovestone faction itself. It was that group which first organized bands of hoodlums to break up the mass meetings called by us. It was that group which first burglarized a private residence which temporarily housed our office, and stole our files and documents (which they have yet to return). It was that group which sent armed tuogh guys to beat up our comrades when they attempted to sell the Militant at meetings or in front of Party buildings. It was that group —all these deeds, of course, in active collaboration with the Foster faction—which first established the "theory" that our meetings are to be disrupted in the same sense that monarchist meetings are to be attacked!

We condemned those methods when applied against us. We condemn them now when there are still instances of them. We condemn them equally when the Party bureaucrats use them against the Lovestone faction or any of its supporters.

We are not very much interested in Stephens personally. We know him only as an irresponsible person, a man with little or no principles in the movement, a careerist whose services are very easily purchased in a factional struggle. We know further that Stephens himself, while district organizer of the Party in Kansas City, tried to terrorize the Party members against "fraternizing with the Trotskyist counter-revolutionaries". We know that Stephens himself, while district organizer of the Party in Boston, organized, just a little while ago, a thugs' assault upon a Lovestonieite meeting there where Ben Gitlow, his newly-found leader, was the principal speaker.

Nor are we very much convinced by the virtuous protests of the Lovestone leaders, and their moral indignation. We have yet to see their paper condemn the deportation of comrade Trotsky. We have yet to see them condemn the imprisonment and exile of thousands of Oppositionists in the Soviet Union. We have yet to see them condemn the atrocious murder of comrade Jacob Blumkin, and the recent assassination of two more Oppositionists by Stalin, beside which the attack upon Stephens looks like an insignificant incident. These are questions to which Lovestone must still reply.

Away with Fascist Tactics!

But Lovestone's past and present attitude neither justify nor diminish the enormity of the Stalinists' crimes. Their continuation will rob the whole movement of its great moral and political power to fight the same crimes when they are practised against the Left wing by the reformists and reactionaries. They will alienate the workers of our movement and make it hateful for them. They are a manifestation of political and theoretical impotence. They pervert the whole conception of the historically progressive value of violence in the class struggle, degrading it into the reactionary weapon of a fear-stricken clique. These fascist methods must be exposed and condemned. They must be burned out of the movement, and those who advocate and practise it eliminated with them.

If the number on your wrapper is

44

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

Unemployment in Minneapolis

MINNEAPOLIS—

Twelve thousand people jammed the Minneapolis Municipal Auditorium and five thousand more were turnd away from the monster unemployment protest meeting called April 23rd by the Organization and Education Committee of the Central Labor Union.

Unemployment Severe

This turnout proves positively the deep-growing inroads unemployment has made into the lives of Minneapolis workers and demonstrates how they will respond to a to aid themselves during the present crisis in industry. The railroads are putting into effect a 15% reduction in payroll The building trades see no great pickup in spring building. Layoff, speedup, and wage-cuts are the order of the day. Only the Ford plant seems to be running full blast with 3,300 men, but they also are planning a short season. All conditions were excellent for a packed meeting. The Auditorium was donated by the City Council. Floyd B. Olson, the Farmer-Labor Candidate for governor was the big drawing card. Walter Frank, R. D. Cramer and other labor officials scheduled to speak, Eddie Dunsteder, the theatre organist, and the Kiddie Review, to amuse the crowd.

The stage was set. Amplifiers broadcasted the speeches to every corner of the building. Thousands roamed the corridors trying to sneak in against the Fire Marshall's orders. Yet with all these favorable circumstances the meeting lacked spirit. The speakers quibbled and hedged with the main problems...the chain store hokum was stressed...buy union label card goods and solve unemployment...vote for Floyd B. Olson for governor:Labor's friend. Walter Frank's attempt at a real analysis was weak and lacked any concrete proposals for the solution of unemployment, which the workers could profit from.

It is not surprising that over one half the audience dribbled out before the main speaker got the floor. The reason was obvious: No program was laid down to combat and abolish unemployment. Workers know and no spellbinders can convince them otherwise, that the union label hocuspocus is no solution for unemployment or any other big problem of the labor movement. Frank's vague reference to an "industrial and political democracy" which he somehow picked up in his brief stay in the Communist movement is a cheap "socialist" fig-leaf concealing his seat on the Olson band-wagon.

Cramer Has Ross Pinched

And behind the scenes what do we find? We find a connivance with the police to prevent a real message getting to the workers. The only piece of literature on unmeployment distributed at that meeting was put out by the Communist League. R. E. Cramer, editor of the Labor Review, who apparently has influence at police headquarters ordered the literature banned. The cops led us a merry chase and finally arrested Joe Ross who is a member of Cramer's own local, and well known for his activity in the Brooks Parlor Furniture strike. Cramer claims that these leaflets were likely to disrupt the meeting. This proves Cramer's lack of faith and hypocritical disbelief in his own program—or lack of it. Eight thousand of the leaflets were distributed.

It should be noted that the Communist Party in line with its latest tactics "boycotted" this mass meeting of workers as "social-fascist" and went off to talk to itself on Bridge Square about the Communist duty to go to the masses.

The success and fine spirit of the May Day meeting held by the Communist League proved the correctness of our program of working among the masses of workers.

The May Day parade, what it lacked in numbers, made up in spirit and the "Trotskyites" contributed most of the spirit. We introduced the singing of revolutionary songs on the line of march.

The terms "counter-revolutionary" and "renegade" which so sneeringly rolls off the tongues of Party bureaucrats these days ring rather hollow and stir resentment in the hearts of non-Party workers, who on revolutionary holidays like May 1st want to see unity of Communist forces before the masters.

—CARL COWL

AFTER YEN BAY

The Revolt in Indo-China

The "value" of colonization from the point of view of the economic development of colonized countries has already been stressed. The lovers of hasty conclusions will exclaim: "But then we cannot understand why you fight colonization?" It is to forestall this objection, as simple as it is stupid, that we have added: "Born of the brutal fact of conquest and not of the normal process of evolution, the industrial revolution brought about by colonization is thoroughly artificial."

It is now a question of drawing the most important consequences from this observation.

It is obvious that without this political conquest by the European, American and Japanese imperialisms, the present colonies would, as a result of a vital necessity of economic evolution, have entered the path of rational prodction, of machinism, anyway.

On the other hand, colonial experience gives us an example of a country whose rythm of development is manifestly retarded by this political domination itself: India. There, the "presence of the alien" has enabled Gandhi to build up and spread his ultra-reactionary theory of non-violence and non-cooperation based on a sentimental reaction against the machine, the devil of the Occident, a reaction which unfortunately keeps the Indian masses, for quite a time too long, alas!, closer to political mysticism than to even a superficial examination of the concrete conditions of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Forty years of military penetration to establish a politial domination, which represents a considerable loss of energies which could have made marvels (bourgeois, of course) in the economic and scientific domain and which were wasted in the guerrila fighting, the conspiracies and struggles of interest between the ruling dynasty and foreign imperialism. And then, when about 1900, the French bourgeoisie began its economic penetration into Indo-China, it was the era of organized waste, for example, works of a million which cost ten times as much in the budget, the friends of the governors pocketing the surplus.

Moreover, the native agrarian bourgeoisie, in conflict with the French industrialists from the very beginning—the latter having at its disposal a powerful military and political force, and still having the memories of the recent civil wars, removed its opponent from the industrial and commercial field.

This struggle for the strengthening of the political power of imperialism, for the "legalization" of an illegal act, the conquest, contributed largely to retard the development of the new economy which the French bourgeoisie wanted as a monopoly, especially at the beginning of its industrial life where the narrowness of its economic field and the little emphasized character of the division of labor did not economically cement the two bourgeoisies.

This is how the difference between French Indo-China, colonized country ,and Siam, once vassal of Indo-China, can be established from the economic point of view. The latter, on a area of 630,000 square kilometers, that is, 170,00 sq. kil. less than Indo-China, and with a third of its population, has a railroad line 150 percent as developed as Indo-China's (Siam: 2,900 km. Indo-China: 1924 km.)

Thus the native bourgeoisie (we mean the .ndustrial and commercial bourgeoisie and not the feudal) born of an artificial clash, is basically incapable of properly fulfilling its historical role.

Smitten with congenital impotence, "placed between two fires", it has never been and never will be able to live its independent life. History has inscribed its oscillations now towards the imperialist bourgeoisie (French) without this bourgeoisie, at least till the latest times, uniting or allying itself with one or the other of the two Indo-Chinese social poles.

After many gropings, the Indo-Chinese bourgeoisie is falling pitiably into the only political formula that fits it: Franco-Annamite collaboration based on a vague equality, upon justice and courtesy (!) in reality, upon the unequal sharing, but still sharing, of Indo-China and the surplus values extracted from the forced labor of the Indo-Chinese masses.

Contrary to other bourgeoisies supported more or less by deceived masses, the Annamite bourgeoisie has entered upon the political scene without having first been able to rally any part of the masses. This explains the brutal, "inelegant" manner with which the French government, conscious of this fact, treats it. Twice the most authorized representatives of France, importuned by the demand of our elected bourgeois, have told them flatly: "You represent nothing at all."

After this declaration that the native bourgeoisie, artificially born, is incapable of any revolt, we now hear Doriot propound his colonial theory. "Bourgeois democratic revolution first," he recently said in the Civil Engineers Hall of rue Blanche. There immediately unfolds before my eyes with blinding clearness the horrible scenes of torture in China at the time of the Chiang Kai-Shek-Stalin "revolutionary" experiment.

Cannot Doriot understand that the native bourgeoisie, suffering from congenital impotence, will not embark on a democratic revolution, but will align themselves on the side of imperialism?

And besides, there exists a world situation within which Indo-China is included. Capitalism extends to the farthest corners of Asia. The world, despite the fact that politically it is still composed of many nations, tends to form an economic whole. In addition, democracy is sufficiently expose so that there can no longer be any place for a democratic revolution.

Bourgeois revolution or proletarian socialist revolution no other issue.

But if one can distinguish the real from the formal, it can be said that in reality the world bourgeois revolution parallels capitalist expansion itself in all its forms.

There remains now the proletarian socialist revolution. Of course, that will not be achieved at one blow. There is a complicated process, that is, stages which we can fix only after having thrown light on the situation created by the artificial blow of colonization upon the peasantry and the proletariat, and after having explained the manner of conceiving relations between these two classes, as well as the role of the intellectual revolutionaries. There is also the uneven development of capitalism. This means that the actual revolutionary struggle cannot be limited to generalizations, to theories concocted in the anteroom of the international bureau. Step by step, we must follow the dynamic relations of the united forces, the temporary harmony among them, strengthened or destroyed by the later developments of the struggle. We can nevertheless say one thing. The revolutionary party which will succeed is that which, while maintaining an ideological intransigeance and fighting the opportunist concessions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution type, will know how, in the field of action, to pass over the "revolutionary compromises" with the temporary allies and to provoke splits within the heterogeneous camp of the enemy.

—AN INDOCHINESE COMMUNIST

The Inconsistency of the S. L. P.

KANSAS CITY—

It is amusing how the Socialist Labor Party decries revolutionary action on the part of the workers; and, at the same time, pretends to defend the Soviet Union which was established by revolution. I quote from three separate paragraphs of a pamphlet entitled "Americanism" issued by the S.L.P.:

"It is self-evident that it is the Proletarian Revolution in Russia which has aroused the capitalist class of this country to realization and action. All means are good to a desperate ruling class, as long as the hope is held out of prolongation of power. (Referring to direct action propagandists.) When it is not possible to soften the worker's brain by cajolery, or gouge it out by jingoism, then by all means let it be beaten out by policemen's clubs or shot out by Winchester rifles."

The author of the pamphlet did not consider the fact that the Revolution in Russia would never have been brought about had not the workers of that country dared to face clubs and rifles. Had S.L.P. tactics been followed in Russia, the nation would still have been prostate under the iron heel of the Romanoffs.

The inconsistency of the S. L. P. is further shown by the fact that its official organ, the Weekly People, has, at the same time, been publishing a biography of Lenin and ridiculing Communists as "comesoonists". A Communist alive is, according to S. L. P reasoning, a hair-brained fanatic, while one dead is a great proletarian hero.

We wonder if both the purveyors of capitalistic and Menshevik bromides are not attempting to soften the brains of the workers by cajolery. One teaches them to acquiesce in robbery; the other fails to teach him the correct tactics wherewith to eliminate the robber. In the present crucial moment, when class lines are being drawn firmly and sharply, when the workers are struggling for emancipation, the S. L. P. continues to sit on the fence and make asinine quips at those who are genuinely laboring to overthrow capitalism.

In the very words of the S. L. P., "all means are good to a desperate ruling power." If they ever examined history, the S. L. P. writers would be forced to observe that no ruling class has ever succumbed without a struggle. The capitalist class is no exception to the rule as its past record and present conduct show.

—HAROLD PREECE

SINCE LENIN DIED

By Max Eastman

The book that first told the inside story of the struggle between the Opposition and the bureaucracy inthe Communist Party in Russia. The details of how the conspiracy was hatched against Leon Trotsky by Stalin, Zinoviev Bucharin and others, was recounted originally in this excellnt volume. It is invaluable for an understanding of present day events in Russian and the world Communist movement.

158 pages

Cloth bound: $1.00 **Paper: 60 cents**

Send All Orders to

The Militant 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Doonping on China

Charlatanism as a Cover for the Concealment of Adventurism

There is no other way to characterize the article "The Rising Revolutionary Wave and Trotsky Liquidation in China" by R. Doonping in the March issue of the "Communist" than as charlatanry and falsehood. It is not a polemical contribution written by someone convinced of his point of view—right or wrong—or of a confused revolutionist,, but a piece of cheap slander, bought and paid for. That it can disgrace the pages of even so rotten a review as the "Communist" is a pitiable commentary on the theoretical abyss into which Stalinism is dragging our movement.

What Should Not Be Forgotten

When a supporter of the Stalinist policies in China dares to proclaim and defend them publicly against the views—confirmed a thousand times over—of the Opposition, at the same time spewing his slanders upon Trotsky who was chiefly responsible for shaping a course towards Bolshevism in China, it is first of all necessary to repeat a number of plain **facts,** which all the squirming of the bureaucrats will never down:

1. Stalin-Bucharin-Martinov were the principal props for Chiang Kai-Shek until the very last moment. The Opposition demanded that the Communists break with Chiang Kai-Shek and warned in advance—not after the fact, Doonping, but in advance—against his certain betrayal.

2. Stalin and Co. subordinated the Communist Party to Chiang Kai-Shek and the Kuo Min Tang. Under Stalin, the Chinese Communist Party, in a written document pledged itself not to criticize Sun Yat Senism. Under Stalin, the Chinese C. P. declared that it had differences "only in matters of detail" with the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang. Under Stalin the Chinese Communist Party was made to obey the discipline and decisions of the bourgeois K.M.T. The Opposition demanded—in time, not after the C. P. had been drowned in its own blood—the freedom of action, the political and organizational independence of the Chinese C. P.

3. On the very eve of the moment that Chiang Kai-Shek was entering Shanghai with his army to let loose a horrible reign of terror against the Chinese workers, Stalin was crushing the Opposition in Moscow because it declared that Chiang would soon show himself to be the Chinese Gallifet. Stalin then declared that "we will still go a long way with Chiang Kai-Shek" (March 1927). At the moment that Chiang Kai-Shek was beginning the slaughter of the Shanghai proletariat the French Communist Party sent the K. M. T. a telegram greeting the entry into Shanghai as the "Chinese Commune".

4. When the Hankow government of Wang Chin-Wei and Co. was formed, Stalin praised it as the "only revolutionary center" as the organizer of the agrarian revolution (no less.)—only to have it appear in its full stature of strangler of the proletariat and peasantry a brief few weeks later. The Opposition again demanded—in time!—a break with the Wang Chin Weis and the formation of Soviets.

5. Stalin concealed the crying facts of the suppresion of the labor and trade union movement in China, the curbing of the peasant sections, so as not to antagonize, first Chiag, then Feng Yu-Hsiang, finally Wang Chin Wei. The Opposition had to make these facts public in secret and illegal documents.

6. Stalin and Bucharin sent telegrams to the Chinese Communists demanding that the brakes be put upon the peasants movement. The Opposition demanded that it be driven forward in collaboration with the revolutionary movement in the cities.

Chinese Soviets: Now and Then

7. The official brakemen of the Chinese revolution opposed the formation of Soviets when the revolutionary wave was rising and raised, instead, the slogan of a constituent assembly. The Opposition was for the formation of Soviets, at the proper time, when it meant setting tens of millions of workers and peasants into motion for the capture of power.

8. Stalin raised the slogan of Soviets for China only after the crushing of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, after the physical annihilation of the Chinese Communist Party to his ally Chiang Kai-Shek, because he could not and cannot distinguish the face of a revolution from its rump. The Opposition, pointing out only what idiots and blind men cannot see—that the counter-revolution has triumphed in China—has raised the slogan of the constituent assembly for China as a transitional slogan that will revive the mass struggle and lead to the victorious issue of the third Chinese revolution, to the dictatorship of the proletariat which supports itself upon the masses of peasants.

This criminal record of the official apparatus must never be forgotten.

* * *

Now for Mr. Doonping's dishonest article. His two main contentions are that "Trotsky sees no revolutionary perspective in China", i. e., that he is a "liquidator"; and that China still stands before a bourgeois democratic revolution, i. e., not before the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now how does Doonping draw the conclusion that Trotsky sees no revolutionary perspective in China? Because "the theoretical root of Trotsky's mistakes is his erroneous theory of 'permanent revolution'." So Trotsky is an advocate of the "permanent revolution", that is, of the democratic revolution developing into the socialist revolution, of the flow of the class struggle rising steadily towards a higher and broader stage. If that is true(and it is) where does his "liquidationism", his "lack of revolutionary perspective" fits in? Doonping intimates that it is demonstrated in Trotsky's opposition to the slogan of Soviets at the present period, his opposition to the guerrilla warfare endorsed by the Stalinists, in his advocacy of transitional democratic slogans. Where does the one flow from the other? If the Communists do not raise the slogan of "Establish the power of the Soviets" in, let us say, Turkey, does this indicate the absence of a revolutionary perspective? Or, conversely when the Stalinists, breaking with all the teachings of Marxism and Leninism and the experiences of the revolutionary movement, carry thru in China a policy of "Communist" Makhnoism, of adventurist, self-exhausting guerilla warfare, does that prove these perverters of Marxism to be the best revolutionists?

So that Doonping's conscious falsification of Trotsky's positin may be adequately understood we quote from the latter's article, "China and the Constituent Assembly":

Trotsky on the Constituent

"China is not passing through a revolution now but rather a counter-revolution. During such a period, the slogan of Soviets can have meaning only for restricted cadres by preparing them for the third Chinese revolution in the future. This preparation obviously has an enormous importance. To accomplish it, the slogan of Soviets must acompany that of the proletariat's struggle for the dictatorship at the head of all the poor masses of the population, and above all, of the poor peasants. But, besides the preparation by theory and propaganda of the revolutionary cadres for the revolutionary future, there still remains the question of mobilizing as broad as passible workers' circles for active participation in the political life of the period we are traversing."

This is not understood at all by the Stalinists. For their criminal opportunism of yesterday they substitute an equally criminal adventurism today. With the working class crushed, the revolutionary movement decapitated, the order of the day is headed, for them, by the...immediate struggle for power.

But not even for that! The Chinese proletariat has been forbidden to fight for power by the leaders of the Comintern. In China, says Doonping, the task of the moment is the struggle for the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, because says our feeble-minded Marxist, the **remnants** of feudalism **dominate** the economic life of China, like the "remnants" of Doonping's Kuo Min Tangism dominate his thin "Marxist" veneer. This can mean nothing but a repitition of the debacle of Hankow. For what else will this democratic revolution look like? What will be its state form? What class will direct it? What will be its social program? Not a word about this. To speak of the democratic revolution after Nanking, after Hankow, and particularly after the experiences—negative though they were—of the Canton Soviet which proclaimed the **socialist dictatorship,** is to place a "legal" prohibition upon the Chinese proletariat to fight for power and lay the basis for a recurrence of the crimes of Stalinism in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27.

Doonping's Defense of Browder

Two more words on Doonping. He ardently defends Earl Browder from our comrade Charlie Bryne, who in an issue of the Militant, once called Browder "Stalin's Yankee Priest in China". Comrade Bryne spoke more truly than he spoke. And here is the fact. When the nationalist government left Canton for Wuhan, the general Li Ti Sin carried out a coupd'Etat in Canton (December 1926-January 1927). The workers were disarmed. The Canton Committee of the Kuo Min Tang, led by Left wing elements, was dissolved at bayonet point. The workers' groups that protested were hunted down mercilessly and driven into illegality. Yet, after this reactionary action, the delegation of the Comintern, composed of Browder, Tom Mann and Doriot, visited Canton, were received by the butcher Li Ti Sin, and were banqueted and toasted by him without a word of the meekest protest from them against the slaughter of workers. That is the beginning and the end of Browder's revolutionary record in China.

And now, who is Doonping himself that he presumes to teach Marxism and Leninism to Trotsky and the Opposition? He began his revolutionary education in a Chinese bourgeois university, and improved it as a student in Rockefeller's University of Chicago. During the whole period of the Chinese revolution, he was a member and ardent supporter of the Kuo Min Tang, and an opponent of Communism. After the defeat of the revolution, he joined the Communist Party and was forthwith sent to the Far Eastern University in Moscow to absorb the latest brand of Stalinism. Fearless revolutionist that he was, he resisted violently the proposals that he go to China for Communist work, calculating that a head on the shoulders in Moscow is worth two on the ground in Canton. He even wanted to quit the Far Eastern University to return to comfortable America. He was finally granted his heart's desire. To perfect his 100 percent Bolshevik education (Stalin style) he entered Murray Butler's Columbia University where he is now completing his studies—in Marxism, we suppose. In the cozy calm of the university campus, is he not just the man selected by destiny to teach the Opposition the fundamentals of Marx and Lenin?

KLORKEIT

(CLARITY)

MONTHLY ORGAN IN THE JEWISH LANGUAGE OF THE LEFT COMMUNIST OPPOSITION

This 16-page paper is of special interest to all Jewish-speaking workers| Number 1 is already out ond contains:

Lenin's Testament, articles by Leon Trotsky, A. Senin, I. Obin, "Emil", and others

Ten Cents a Copy
One Dollar a Year

Order from
The Militant
25 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

In the Soviet Union

And the Kulak?

MOSCOW—

In a recent number of "Soviet Siberia" one finds a decision of the Executive Committee of the Regional Soviet where, among other things, it says: "Kulak holdings destined to be liquidated are divided into two groups: **1.** The active Kulaks, among the richest, who must be deported to distant localities, and **2.** all the remaining Kulaks who will be left within the limits of their respective districts but who will be put out and distributed over other grounds outside of the limits of the collective farms." This "liquidation" of the Kulak by means of Article 58 and by administrative measure reminds me of the plan of the late Stambulisky ("peasant" prime minister of Bulgaria killed by the fascists) to "uproot entirely" the Communist evil by means of a complete deportation of all the Bulgarian Communists (at that time they counted about 38,000) to the desert islands of the Black Sea littoral or to any other kind of deserted locality. As you see, in this field also our Centrists steal their "ideas" from others, in this case from a petty bourgeois prime minister of Bulgaria.

Voronezh versus Tomsk!

Now for some news. The leaders and semi-leaders of the capitulators have been distributed throughout the U.S.S.R. On this subjected, Radek has reflected thus: "Surely L. D. will exclaim: Let Radek tell us now which is better—Tomsk or Voronezh! Ah! it must be admitted that L. D. was right in his foresight. But what can you do... There is no way out, no way out..."

Three deported Oppositionists were arrested at Schtchedrinsk. They are accused of "having received directives and of spreading them". Quite simply, they are threatened with "solitary" for having corresponded with comrades in a spirit which is not that of the capitulators. With such an accusation, the Centrists can arrest the whole population of the deportees. Moreover that is just what they are beginning to do, for recently four comrades were arrested at Tomsk and shipped to Nizhni-Sibirsk. They would like to finish us off for the Sixteenth "council".

How is your letter of November concerning the "possible or inevitable concessions to the class enemy in the realization of the Five Year Plan' 'to be interpreted? What concessions are you speaking about? Up to where will these concessions go? Perhaps you will write us in detail your opinion on this matter. It would be very useful. As for me, personally, it seems that being given the situation, after all the Centrist madness in the country, the return to the positions of our Platform runs the risk of being interpreted as a **concession.** But since since they cannot go further, I am for **such a concession,** that is, for the recall of the measures which have led to the "generalized mess". I mean the **"generalized** collectivization" accompanied by accusatory "comments".

I am against the "switching" of small agriculture on to the "socialist" rails in one or two years, because I believe that such a switching will yield **absolutely nothing** and because I think the theory of socialism in one country is false. I am against the monstrosities accomplished by the light-hearted Centrists in the country, which make the Kulak a martyr for the "peasant" cause. In a word, I am for the **concession** that would consist in a return **to the position of our Platform.** Is that the kind of concession you speak of in your November letter? Write us about it!

(Note of the Editors: That's it exactly.)

Φ

NTW YORK—Thousands waited in line from 11 p. m. to 9 a. m. and broke glass doors at civil service commission offices to sign up for street cleaning jobs at $6 a day that will not materialize for a year.

Φ

Read the announcement on page two of this issue on the campaign for subscriptions to the Militant. You can help yourself to get a free copy of Trotsky's autobiography or two other books of vital interest by helping the Militant. Read it over and ACT!